



Figure 1. Flow chart of the retrieval process

Table 1: *Descriptive information for the 19 studies included in the meta-analysis*

Name	Publication year	Sample age	Study location	Measurement source	Bully status focus	Sample size
Baly et al.	2014	11.5	USA	Self report	V	382
Bellmore & Cillessen	2006	12.28	USA	Peer report	V	491
Boulton et al.	1999	11.3	UK	Peer report	V	158
Fanti & Kimonis	2013	12.89	Greece	Self report	B&V	1416
Faris & Felmlee	2014	14.5	USA	Peer report	V	4214
Hemphill et al.	2012	12.9	Australia	Self report	B	696
Kendrick et al.	2012	13.72	Sweden	Self report	B&V	880
Kim et al.	2009	13	Korea	Peer report	B&V	1666
Kim et al.	2006	13	Korea	Peer report	B&V	1655
Lam et al.	2014	12.81	China	Self report	B&V	536
Larsen et al.	2012	13.8	The Netherlands	Self report	V	1753
Low & Espelage	2013	13.9	USA	Self report	B	1023
Ma & Bellmore	2012	14.5	USA	Peer report	V	422
Marsh et al.	2001	13.5	USA	Self report	V	4216
Salmivalli & Helteenvuori	2007	11.5	Finland	Peer report	V	255
Salmivalli & Isaacs	2005	12	Finland	Peer report	V	212
Shapero et al.	2013	14	USA	Self report	V	216
Sweeting et al.	2006	11	Scotland	Self report	V	2184
Vaillancourt et al.	2013	10.91	USA	Self report	V	555

Table 2: *Quality assessment ratings of included studies*

Author	<i>Hypothesis clearly described</i>	<i>Main outcomes clearly described</i>	<i>Characteristics of patients described</i>	<i>Main findings clearly described</i>	<i>Estimates of random variability</i>	<i>Actual probability values used</i>	<i>Response rate clearly described</i>	<i>Patients -represent population</i>	<i>Patients prepared-represent</i>	<i>Data dredging</i>	<i>Statistical tests appropriate</i>	<i>Outcome measures valid/reliable</i>	<i>Adjustment for confounding</i>	<i>Sample size or power calculation</i>	Total
Baly et al. (2014)	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	9
Bellmore & Cillessen (2006)	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	9
Boulton et al. (1999)	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	8
Fanti & Kimonis (2013)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	11
Faris & Felmlee (2014)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	9
Hemphill et al. (2012)	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	8
Kendrick et al. (2012)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	10
Kim et al. (2009)	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	6
Kim et al. (2006)	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	8
Lam et al. (2014)	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	10
Larsen et al. (2012)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	12
Low & Espelage (2013)	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	5
Ma & Bellmore (2012)	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	7
Marsh et al. (2001)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	6
Salmivalli & Helteenvuori (2007)	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	8
Salmivalli & Isaacs (2005)	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	9
Shapero et al. (2013)	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	10
Sweeting et al. (2006)	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	8

Vaillancourt et al. (2013)

1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 0 11

Table 3: *Effect size and heterogeneity statistics for predictors of victimisation*

Variable	Outcome	Effect					Heterogeneity		
		<i>k</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	<i>p</i> -value	<i>T</i>	95% CI	<i>Q</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>I</i> ²
Conduct problems1	V2	2	0.101	0.000	0.00	[0.068, 0.134]	1.18	0.227	15.31
Internalising problems1	V2	6	0.090	0.000	0.03	[0.055, 0.125]	8.28	0.142	39.59
Social problems1	V2	5	0.102	0.049	0.09	[0.001, 0.202]	16.57	0.002	75.85
V1	V2	12	0.506	0.000	0.20	[0.417, 0.585]	519.83	0.000	97.88
V2	V3	8	0.598	0.000	0.32	[0.434, 0.724]	758.20	0.000	99.08
V3	V4	2	0.444	0.000	0.09	[0.320, 0.554]	5.01	0.025	80.02

Table 4: *Effect size and heterogeneity statistics for predictors of bullying*

Variable	Outcome	Effect					Heterogeneity		
		<i>k</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	<i>p</i> -value	<i>T</i>	95% CI	<i>Q</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>I</i> ²
Age1	B2	2	-0.043	0.039	0.00	[-0.082, -0.003]	0.54	0.464	0.00
Conduct problems1	B2	3	0.139	0.000	0.04	[0.085, 0.192]	5.06	0.080	60.45
Social problems1	B2	2	0.206	0.000	0.00	[0.101, 0.307]	0.64	0.423	0.00
School problems1	B2	2	0.127	0.000	0.00	[0.072, 0.182]	0.25	0.615	0.00